

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/544,259 | ALTENSCHOPFER ET AL. | |

All Participants: _____ **Status of Application:** _____

(1) S. Tran. (3) ____.

(2) Stephen E. Reiter. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 25 February 2009 **Time:** _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

to place the application in condition for allowance, it was suggested to: 1) incorporate the limitation of claim 8 into all independent claims; 2) correct the 112, first and second paragraph rejections; and 3) amend the phrase "comprising" in line 4 to "consisting essentially". Applicant's attorney instead proposed to incorporate limitations of claims 2 and 3 into claim 1. No agreement was reached.

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

